

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-12, 14 and 16 are amended and new claims 18-20 are added. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

The courtesies extended to Applicants' representatives by Examiner Hardee at the interview held November 26, 2003, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

The Office Action requires restriction of non-elected claims 15 and 17. Applicant reaffirms, as already stated in the July 23, 2003 Confirmation of Telephone Election, that Group I was elected. This requirement is respectfully traversed.

The basis for the Restriction Requirement is that the inventions listed as Group I - III do not relate to single general inventive concepts because they lack the same or corresponding special technical feature. The sole reason for this assertion appears to be that none of the claims in the elected group are currently deemed allowable. Accordingly, it is clear that when the prior art rejections are overcome, assuming that there is still a common feature among the restricted groups, the Restriction Requirement will be moot. As discussed below, it is believed that the elected claims are patentably distinct from the applied prior art, including the references marked "X" in the PCT search report. Furthermore, the "coolant with a low conductivity" feature of elected claim 1 is also present in Group II, claim 15 and Group III, claim 17, and is believed to be a novel feature as discussed below. Therefore, the lack of unity alleged by the Patent Office is no longer in effect. Accordingly, the Restriction Requirement is now moot and must be withdrawn. Applicants respectfully request rejoinder and allowance of claims 15 and 17.

The Office Action objects to the specification because it contains a number of terms which do not appear in contemporary chemical English. By this Amendment, the specification is amended to correct faulty translations. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Applicants assert that the above-described amendment to claim 3 obviates the grounds to the rejection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejection of claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 9-11 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Applicants assert that the above described amendments to the claims obviate the ground for the rejection. With respect to claim 14, "deoxidation" is clear and concise. See, for example, page 18, line 8+ of Applicants' specification. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-11, 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over JP 52-106116A ('116), and claims 1-4, 8 and 10-14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Perry et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,534,172) (Perry). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

As agreed during the personal interview, neither '116 nor Perry disclose or suggest a coolant with a low electric conductivity, as recited in independent claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants assert that independent claim 1 is patentably distinct from '116 and from Perry. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claim 1 and its dependent claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-6, 8-14 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Perry, and claims 1-14 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Eggers et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,354,949) (Eggers). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

As also agreed during the personal interview, since the compositions of the solutions in Perry and Eggers disclose ionic compounds of various amounts, and in the case of Perry, of unspecified amounts, and since very small amounts of ionic compounds can significantly increase the electric conductivity of a solution, neither Perry nor Eggers render obvious the feature of low conductivity recited in Applicants' independent claim 1. Moreover, Applicants assert that the compositions disclosed in Applicants' invention confer unexpected results to the solution such as, for instance, a low conductivity, as recited in independent claim 1.


Accordingly, Applicants assert that independent claim 1 and its dependent claims define patentable subject matter. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 19 and 20 depend from allowable claims 15 and 17 respectively, and hence also define patentable subject matter.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-20 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Stephen P. Catlin
Registration No. 36,101

JAO:SPC:TMN/cmf

Date: December 2, 2003

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--